



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,647	12/08/2003	Tsz Simon Cheng	BOC9-2003-0054 (425)	2979
40987	7590	05/28/2008		
AKERMAN SENTERFITT P. O. BOX 3188 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			EXAMINER MUHEBBULLAH, SAJEDA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/730,647	Applicant(s) CHENG ET AL.	
	Examiner SAJEDA MUHEBBULLAH	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-11,13-20,22-26 and 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-11,13-20,22-26 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to RCE/Amendment filed on 03/13/2008.
2. Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-20, 22-26, and 28 are pending in this application. Claims 12 and 27 have been cancelled and claims 1, 13, 16, and 28 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 8, 13, 15-20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janes et al. ("Janes", US 6,642,346) in view of Beaudet et al. ("Beaudet", US 5,491,795) and Balasubramanian et al. ("Balasubramanian", US 2003/0046289).

As per claim 1, Janes teaches an electronic commerce method comprising the steps of:

determining at least one e-commerce partner (Fig.2G, *Vendor 2*);

determining whether said e-commerce partner is an active partner based on at least one predetermined criteria, wherein determining whether said e-commerce partner is an active partner comprises at least one of the following steps:

detecting whether a transaction has occurred with said e-commerce partner within a designated time period (col.8, lines 19-21, *orders must have occurred within a designated time period to have been made*);

determining whether transactions involving said e-commerce partner exceed a designated valuation threshold;

determining whether a transaction involving said e-commerce partner exceeds a designated data size; and

determining whether said e-commerce partner has a preference level above a designated preference level (col.8, lines 19-21);

presenting a partner identifier within a commerce graphical user interface for said e-commerce partner, wherein within said commerce graphical user interface the partner identifier is an expandable node (Fig.2G, *Vendor 2*);

presenting an expansion of at least one of said nodes within said commerce graphical user interface (Fig.2G, *Vendor 2*);

for each expansion, presenting at least one transaction identifier as a child node of said expanded node, wherein each transaction identifier represents an electronic commerce transaction between a user of the commerce graphical user interface and said e-commerce partner (Fig.2G, *Vendor 2 expanded presents transaction 901*).

categorizing a node associated with at least one of a transmission and an e-commerce partner;

visually differentiating said node from other nodes based upon a category of said node (Fig.2G, *Vendor 2 icon different from 901 icon*; col.9, lines 43-45).

However, Janes does not teach differentiating nodes at the same node level and at different node level and assigning responsible personnel to transactions based on predetermined rules. Beaudet teaches a method of displaying differentiating nodes at the same and different

levels (Beaudet, Fig.4, col.4, lines 37-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Beaudet's teaching with Janes method in order to visualize the different transactions.

Furthermore, the method of Janes and Beaudet does not teach assigning responsible personnel to transactions based on predetermined rules. Balasubramanian teaches a method of processing transactions wherein based on the transaction type, the transaction is assigned to the appropriate agent (Balasubramanian, para.0050). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Balasubramanian's teaching with the method of Janes and Beaudet in order to streamline issues to the appropriate expertise to handle the issue faster and more effectively.

As per claim 2, Janes teaches the method wherein said electronic commerce transactions include at least one business-to-business transaction, and wherein said e-commerce partners include at least one trading partner (Fig.2G, *trading partner Vendor 2*).

As per claim 3, Janes teaches the method further comprising the step of: providing a business partner gateway, wherein said commerce graphical user interface is an interface for interacting with said business partner gateway (col.3, lines 37-40).

As per claim 4, Janes teaches the method wherein said electronic commerce transactions include at least one business-to-consumer transaction, and wherein said e-commerce partners include at least one consumer (col.3, lines 61-67).

As per claim 5, Janes teaches the method wherein only active partners are displayed in said presenting step (col.8, lines 19-21).

As per claim 8, Janes teaches the method further comprising the step of: detecting a transmission error; and indicating within said graphical user interface that an error occurred during an associated transmission (Fig.9, col.11, lines 47-55).

Claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 16-20 are similar in scope to claims 1-5 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claims 7, 9-11, 14, 22, 24-26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janes et al. ("Janes", US 6,642,346), Beaudet et al. ("Beaudet", US 5,491,795) and Balasubramanian et al. ("Balasubramanian", US 2003/0046289).in view of Xu (US 2004/0119743).

As per claim 7, Janes teaches the method where only active partners are displayed (Janes, col.8, lines 19-21). However, Janes does not teach the method further comprising the step of providing an administrative graphical user interface configured to adjust at least one parameter used to define whether an e-commerce partner is an active partner. Xu teaches a method of displaying transactions in a commerce environment wherein a parameter may be adjusted to display only those transactions associated an active partner (Xu, para.0077). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Xu's teaching with Janes' method in order to filter out relevant information.

As per claim 9, Janes teaches the method comprising the step of receiving a selection specifying a node of said graphical user interface (Janes, col.9, lines 29-30). However, Janes does not teach the step of responsively establishing a communication session between a user of said commerce graphical user interface and the e-commerce partner associated with said node. Xu teaches a method of displaying transactions in a commerce environment wherein a communication session may be established between a user and partner (Xu, para.0078, para.0093). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Xu's teaching with Janes' method in order to interact with partners in real-time.

As per claim 10, Xu teaches the method of claim 9, wherein said communication session is an instant messaging session (para.0094).

As per claim 11, Xu teaches the method of claim 9, wherein said establishing step further comprises the steps of: selecting a communication channel and establishing said communication session through said communication channel (para.0094).

Claim 14 and 28 are individually similar in scope to claim 9, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 24-26 are similar in scope to claims 9-11 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 03/13/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued the following:

a) Janes fails to provide any mechanism for determining whether a particular customer is an active customer. In particular, Janes does not detect whether a transaction has occurred with said e-commerce partner within a designated time period; determine whether transactions involving said e-commerce partner exceed a designated valuation threshold; determine whether a transaction involving said e-commerce partner exceeds a designated data size; or determine whether said e-commerce partner has a preference level above a designated preference level.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per a), Janes teaches the display of active partners to be those customers with orders (col.8, lines 19-21) which is the step of detecting whether a transaction has occurred with said e-commerce partner within a designated time period. Orders must have occurred within a designated time period to have been made. In addition, Applicant's specification states that partners with pending transactions can be considered active partners (Applicant spec, para.0026).

Art Unit: 2174

Communications

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajeda Muhebbullah whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4065**. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday/Thursday and alt. Mondays from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley, can be reached on (571) 272-3923.

The central fax number for the organization where correspondence for this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sajeda Muhebbullah

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2174

/S. M./

/David A Wiley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174